



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,802

10/22/2003

Dan W. Pratt

COR-1075-US

6673

24923 7590 08/21/2007
PAUL S MADAN
MADAN, MOSSMAN & SRIRAM, PC
2603 AUGUSTA DRIVE, SUITE 700
HOUSTON, TX 77057-5662

EXAMINER

BERGIN, JAMES S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3641

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/691,802	Applicant(s) PRATT ET AL.	
	Examiner James S. Bergin	Art Unit 3641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/11/2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23-31 and 33-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-19, 24, 26-31 and 39-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20, 21, 23, 25 and 33-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a shaped charge device comprising: a) liner formed of a particulated filler material, such as powdered aluminum; and b) a **metal cap disposed upon the liner**, the jet produced by the explosion of the device forming a jet having a forward portion and a substantially particulated portion of lower density than the forward portion, does not reasonably provide enablement for a shaped charge device that does not include a metal cap . The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The specification does not describe an embodiment of the shaped charge device that does not have a **metal cap disposed upon the liner**, and that is still capable of producing a jet having a forward portion and a substantially particulated portion of lower density than the forward portion. **Without the metal cap being disposed upon the liner, the jet produced by the detonation of the cap-less liner would be comprised only of the lower density particulated material.**

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 21, it is unclear whether the limitation, "filler material" refers to the liner material pre-explosion or to the particulated portion of the jet post-explosion?

Claim 20, 21, 23, 25 and 34-38 are rejected as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: a metal cap disposed upon the liner. Absent the metal cap disposed upon the liner, it is unclear how, upon detonation of the shaped charge device, a jet is produced that comprises a forward portion and a substantially particulated portion of lower density than the forward portion? **Without the metal cap being disposed upon the liner, the jet produced by the detonation of the cap-less liner would be comprised only of the lower density particulated material.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 3641

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a & e) as being clearly anticipated by Liu (US 2003/0037692 A1).

Liu clearly anticipates the applicants' claimed invention and discloses a shaped charge for perforating a stimulating subterranean comprising a metal cap layer 11 that forms a leading penetrating metal precursor portion of the jet, the cap layer 11 formed from tungsten, iron, tin, copper, lead etc., and liner layer 12 formed from compacted aluminum powder, that forms the following less dense portion of the jet that penetrates the formation and reacts completely with water to create a powerful explosion in the perforation (see Liu, paragraph [0137] - [0143]; figs. 6, 7, 8A and 8B). It is inherent to Liu that the less dense portion of the jet formed from the aluminum powder is not formed as a completely solid non-particulated jet, but instead comprises a substantially particulated jet. Note that the applicants' are not claiming a specific particulate size for the particles of the particulated portion of the jet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell (US 6,786,157 B1) in view of Liu (US 2003/0037692 A1).

Regarding claims 20 and 33, Powell discloses a shaped charge 10 explosive device (see abstract; Fig. 1) comprising a charge case 2 (Fig. 1) inherently adapted to be positioned in a perforating gun (col. 8, lines 13-30); an explosive charge 18; a liner 22, 32; a powdered aluminum filling 45 located in the liner cavity (col. 4, lines 5-37); the liner upon detonation of the explosive charge is driven in the same way as that of a conventional shaped charge liner forming a highly energetic, non-cohesive stream (jet) of particles (col. 2, lines 39-47).

Powell does not specifically disclose that the stream (jet) has a forward portion that is denser than the following particulated stream (jet) of particles or that Powell's penetrator comprises a metal cap disposed upon the liner.

Liu discloses a shaped charge for perforating a stimulating subterranean formation (paragraphs [0137] – [0140], Figs. 6, 7, 8A and 8B) comprising a metal cap layer 11 that forms a leading penetrating metal precursor portion of the jet, the cap layer 11 formed from tungsten, iron, tin, copper, lead etc.

In view of Liu, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include a metal cap layer disposed upon Powell's liner, thereby providing Powell's particulated stream (jet) with a more dense leading metal portion with enhanced penetrative properties.

Regarding claims 21, 23 and 35, the particulated portion of Powell's jet is formed from powdered aluminum (col. 4, lines 5-37; col. 2, lines 39-47) which inherently has a

Art Unit: 3641

density of less than 2.7g/cc (note applicants' admission on page 9 of the specification regarding the density of aluminum), which would inherently approximate the density of an oil bearing formation in a downhole environment.

Regarding claim 25, Powell's liner membranes 22, 32 are conical (Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 17-20).

Regarding claim 34, it is inherent to Powell that the liner forming a precursor jet is conformal to the charge case.

Regarding claims 36, 37 and 38, Powell discloses that the shaped charge can be used in a downhole environment for cutting wellbore casings "*narrow bore, thick walled pipes, typical of well liners and drilling shafts*" (col. 8, lines 13-30). When used in a downhole environment, Powell's perforator as modified by Liu **would inherently perforate the subterranean formation** and the particulated portion of the Powells' jet would inherently increase in temperature and inherently reduce intersitial fluid viscosity upon penetration into the subterranean formation.

Response to Arguments

9. The **declaration of Timothy LaGrange filed on 6/11/2007** under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the applied rejections. The declaration does not attempt to establish a new date of invention for the instant application that is prior to the applied references. The examiner wonders whether the applicants' intended to file a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132. Even if the declaration

had been properly filed under 37 CFR 1.131, it would not overcome the art based rejections applied against the claims.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner maintains the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell (US 6,786,157 B1) in view of Liu (US 2003/0037682 A1). As indicated in the final rejection mailed 8/29/2006, the motivation to include a metal cap layer disposed upon Powell's liner so as to provide Powell's particulated jet with a more dense leading metal portion with enhanced penetrative/cutting properties is properly found in Liu. The examiner is not proposing that Powell's modified shaped charge be used in avalanche control, but instead be used in Powell's disclosed "downhole" applications. Powell and Liu comprise analogous art and Powell discloses that the shaped charge can be used in a downhole environment such as for cutting wellbore casings "narrow bore, thick walled pipes, typical of well liners and drilling shafts" (see Powell, col. 8, lines 13-30). Powell's shaped charge, as modified by the addition of a metal cap, as taught by Liu, **would possess enhanced cutting/ penetrative properties for cutting/ penetrating well liner pipe either above ground, or when lowered into the well bore** while attached to a perforating gun, as is well known in the art. Cutting a well bore pipe inherently involves **penetrating through** the body of the pipe during the cutting process. **Powell's liner as modified by Liu would possess enhanced pipe cutting properties (cutting that inherently includes penetrating through the pipe).**

The examiner maintains the rejection of claims 20, 21, 23, 25 and 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a & e) as being clearly anticipated by Liu (US 2003/0037692 A1). It is inherent to Liu that the less dense portion of the jet formed from the aluminum powder is not formed as a completely solid non-particulated jet, but instead comprises a substantially particulated jet. Note that the applicants' are not claiming a specific particulate size for the particles of the particulated portion of the jet.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Bergin whose telephone number is 571-272-6872. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Wednesday and Friday, 8.30 - 5.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Carone can be reached on 571-272-6873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James S. Bergin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3641

/James S. Bergin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3641

Application/Control Number: 10/691,802
Art Unit: 3641

Page 10